

carboxylic acid cake to a vapor seal zone". Description of this step can be found in applicants' disclosure starting on page 22, line 15. This limitation is found in every independent claim and thus in all dependant claims as well.

Applicants wish to respectfully point out that this is not the step (b) that examiner argued was anticipated. The step that examiner pointed out in the last office action corresponds to a solid-liquid displacement step which is different from the step described on page 22 of the disclosure related to a vapor seal zone. This step relating to the vapor seal zone corresponds to step (d) in the disclosure. However, it can be step (b), (c), or (d) in the claims depending on which optional step is in the claims or omitted. For example, this corresponds to step (b) in claim 1 "routing ..... to a vapor seal zone", or in claim 6, it is step (c), and finally in claim 34, it is step (d). Therefore since the reference cited does not disclose the vapor seal zone step, applicants argue that the claims distinguish over the cited art.

## **Issue II: Objected Claim (35 U.S.C 103)**

Claims 48-51 were objected to for being dependant on a multiple dependant claim. This objection is respectfully traversed. MPEP 608.1 (n) states "a multiple dependent claim shall not serve as a basis for any other multiple dependent claim." However, applicants wish to respectfully state that it is permissible to have a dependant claim that depends on a multiple dependant claim. Applicants do not know of any rule in the MPEP that prohibits this and respectfully asks that the examiner remove the

objection to the claims. In addition, in the MPEP 608.1 Example B, subsection F, as well as in the fee calculation subsection G, examples are shown where a dependant claim depends on a multiple dependant claim. In addition, claims 46-51 were objected to for being dependant on a base claim. However, if applicants' arguments are persuasive then the base claim would not be rejected and the objection should be removed.


### Conclusion

The application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection(s), remove all rejections, and pass the application to issuance.

Eastman Chemical Company  
P.O. Box 511  
Kingsport, Tennessee 37662

Phone: (423) 229-5534  
FAX: (423) 229-1239


Respectfully submitted,

  
Steven A. Owen  
Registration No. 50,355

8/12/2005  
Date

#### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 37 CFR 1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence and any items identified as being included herewith is/are, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

  
Kristi D. Huff

8/15/05  
Date